



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,750	11/13/2001	Olivier Hericourt	FR920000073US1	4960

45092 7590 10/16/2006

HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

ABYANEH, ALI S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/007,750

Applicant(s)

HERICOURT ET AL.

Examiner

Ali S. Abyaneh

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are pending.
2. Claims 1, 7 and 9 are amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08-01-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends, "the method of van Oorschot et al. requires at least two certificate authorities" and "Van Oorschot et al. clearly do not teach a method for filtering certificates issued from as few as one certificate authority..." . Examiner respectfully disagrees because " **as few as one** certificate authority" does not mean only one single certificate authority and it could be interpreted as one or more certificate authority. Furthermore, Van Oorschot teaches a table including identification of individual certificate authorities, this clearly reads on the applicant's claim limitation (see column 5, lines 7-14 and column 9, lines 32-36).

In view of above discussion examiner maintains the rejection as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2137

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated Paul C.

Van Oorschot et al. (US Patent NO. 6,134,550)

Regarding Claim 1

Van Oorschot teaches a method for filtering certificates issued from as few as one certificate authority (CA), the method comprising the steps of: receiving a certificate and storing the certificate (column 9, lines 27); preventing use of the certificate until validation (column 1, lines 50-55); identifying a certificate authority that has issued the certificate (column 5, lines 7-14); identifying a certificate authority filter by referring to a table, that comprises identification of at least one certificate authority filter(column4, lines 52-62); sending a request to the identified certificate authority filter (column 5, lines 14-17); receiving from the identified certificate authority filter a response to the request, the response comprising information related to the certificate authority that has issued the certificate and a public key of the certificate authority that has issued the certificate (column 5, lines 4-23); determining according to the response whether the certificate authority is a trusted certificate authority; and validating the certificate if the certificate authority that has issued the certificate is a trusted certificate authority (column 5, lines 14-25).

Regarding Claim 2

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method comprising the step of: discarding the certificate if the response indicates that the certificate authority that has issued the certificate is not a trusted certificate authority (column 8, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 3

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the step of identifying the certificate authority that has issued the certificate comprises the further step of: retrieving an identification of the certificate authority from the certificate (column 2, lines 26-28 and column 5, lines 4-13).

Regarding Claim 4

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the step of sending a request to the identified certificate authority filter comprises the further step of: including in said request an identification of the certificate authority that has issued the certificate (column 5, lines 7-13).

Regarding Claim 5

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the response received from the identified certificate authority filter comprises a level of trust assigned to the certificate authority, and wherein the step of determining according to the response whether the certificate authority is a trusted certificate authority comprises the further step of: checking whether the level of trust assigned to the certificate authority corresponds to a level of trust of a trusted certificate authority (column2, lines 8-19) .

Regarding Claim 6

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the step of validating the certificate comprises the further steps of: comparing the public key included in the response received from the identified certificate authority filter with a public key included in a response from a second certificate authority filter; and validating the certificate if the public key included in the response received from the identified certificate authority filter is the same as the public key received in the response from the second certificate authority filter (column2, lines 8-19).

Regarding Claim 7

Van Oorschot teaches a method, in as few as one certificate authority filter connected to a network, for filtering certificates issued from as few as one certificate authority, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a request comprising an identification of a certificate authority; identifying the certificate authority in said request (column 5, lines 14-25); finding in a table the certificate authority, the table comprising: identification of as few as one certificate authority and a level of trust and a public key associated with each of said as few as one certificate((column 5, lines 4-13)(examiner considers certificate chain data as applicant's table)) ; determining a level of trust of the identified certificate authority referring to said table ((column 5, lines 62-67)(examiner considers degree of trust as applicant's level of trust)); retrieving a public key associated with the identified certificate authority referring to said table (column 2, lines 8-23); and sending a response to an originator of the request (column 6, lines 1-12), said response comprising the level of trust of the identified certificate authority and the public key associated with the identified certificate authority (column 5, lines 4-13 and 63-67) .

Regarding Claim 8

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 7 above and furthermore he teaches a method wherein said request further comprises an identification of a destination entity (column 5, lines 4-13)(examiner

considers target certification authority as applicant's destination entity).

Regarding Claim 9


Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 8 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein: the table further includes, associated with the as few as one certificate authority, the destination entity and a level of trust associated with the destination entity; and wherein the step of determining the level of trust further includes the step of determining the level of trust associated with the destination entity by referring to the table (column 11, lines 24-49 and column 5, lines 62-67).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Ali Abyaneh A.A
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2137
10-02-06


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER